

11-2-1972

CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 11/02/1972

Esther Johnston

Follow this and additional works at: <http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes>

Recommended Citation

Johnston, Esther, "CWU Faculty Senate Minutes - 11/02/1972" (1972). *Faculty Senate Minutes*. 450.
<http://digitalcommons.cwu.edu/fsminutes/450>

This Meeting Minutes is brought to you for free and open access by the CWU Faculty Senate Archive at ScholarWorks@CWU. It has been accepted for inclusion in Faculty Senate Minutes by an authorized administrator of ScholarWorks@CWU. For more information, please contact pingfu@cwu.edu.

MINUTES: Regular Sentate Meeting, 1 November 1972
Presiding Officer: David R. Anderson, Chairman
Recording Secretary: Esther Johnston

ROLL CALL

Senators Present: All senators or their alternates were present except Steven Farkas, B. Dean Owens, Bill Cooper, and Jim Cushman.

Others Present: Norman Phelps, Ken Harsha, Pearl Douce', Joel Andress, Larry Lawrence, Dale Comstock, Beverly Heckart, Philip Hanni, Anthony Canedo, Edward Harrington, and W. O. Dugmore.

AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL

The chairman suggested that the following items be added:

1. Under "Communications" add

- (D) Letter from Joel Andress
- (E) Letter from Martin Kaatz
- (F) Letter from Edward J. Harrington
- (G) Letter from James Brooks, dated August 18
- (H) Letter from James Brooks, dated October 12
- (I) Memorandum from James Brooks, dated October 24
- (J) Letter from Robert Benton

2. Under "Old Business" add

- (A) Discussion of Policy on "I" (incomplete)

3. Under "New Business"

- (A) Discuss Proposed Revision of Faculty Code

The chairman asked if there were any further changes. There being none, the Agenda with changes was approved.

APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The minutes of October 4 were approved with the following two changes: on page 5, line 25, add "the motion was voted on and failed by voice vote."

Page 5, line 30, should read as follows: "The chairman called for a roll call vote on Motion No. 867." The remainder of the sentence should be deleted. (Note the change of the Motion No.)

COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were received:

1. A memorandum from Ronald M. Frye, dated October 10, 1972, informing the Senate that Mr. Brunner would be unable to serve as alternate for the Department of Technology and Industrial Education, and a departmental election had been held electing Pete Martinez to serve in Mr. Brunner's place.
2. A memorandum from Luther Baker, dated October 17, 1972, informing the Senate that Pearl Douce' had been elected by the Department of Home Economics to serve as alternate for that department.
3. A memorandum from E. Smith Murphy, Jr., dated October 13, 1972, saying that Willard C. Sperry was elected alternate senator from the Department of Physics to serve the remaining term of Bryan Gore.
4. A letter from Joel M. Andress, dated October 25, 1972, submitting his resignation as Senator representing the Geography Department and informing the Senate that the Georgraphy Department had elected Calvin Willberg to replace him.
5. A letter from Martin Kaatz, dated October 24, 1972, informing the Senate that the Geography Department had elected Calvin Willberg to serve as Senator representing that department, and Otto F. Jakubek had been elected to serve as alternate.
6. A letter from Edward Harrington, dated October 25, 1972, which refers to Section IX, B. 1 of the Code and recommends that Burton Williams be considered for tenure through the normal procedures. This will be handled under the report of the Vice-Chairman.
7. A letter from James Brooks, dated August 18, 1972, with his comments on the proposed Faculty Code attached to his letter. This is presented as an information item.
8. A letter from James Brooks, dated October 12, 1972, regarding the May 29 Interim Report from the Ad Hoc Committee on Conditions of Faculty Employment.
9. A memorandum from James Brooks, dated October 24, 1972, regarding collective bargaining. The draft bill referred to in the letter will be available in the Faculty Senate Office.
10. A letter from Robert Benton, dated October 26, 1972, asking for information as to which items our faculty wishes included on collective bargaining bills.

REPORTS

A. Executive Committee--Ken Berry reported the following:

1. Positions on several committees, boards and councils are yet to be filled for various reasons. The following nominations are brought to the Senate from the Executive Committee:

Roger Reynolds was nominated for Parliamentarian.

The Executive Committee nominated Chester Keller and Zolton Kramar to serve on the Educational Opportunities Program Board.

The Executive Committee nominated Duncan McQuarrie to serve on the Ethnic Studies Council.

The Senate approved the various nominations.

The Executive Committee nominated Ken Harsha, Victor Marx and Jean Putnam as candidates to serve on the Council of Faculty Representatives.

A ballot was conducted with the Senators voting for two of the nominees. Results of the ballot were: Ken Harsha was elected CFR Representative with Jean Putnam to serve as his alternate.

There is a vacancy on the Curriculum Committee due to the resignation from the Senate of Joel Andress. The Executive Committee nominated Jim Applegate to serve.

Cornelius Gillam was nominated by the Senators.

A ballot was conducted and Jim Applegate was elected to serve on the Curriculum Committee.

Mr. Berry then announced that at the October Senate meeting the Senate nominated three faculty members to serve on the Campus Judicial Council. These faculty are to be either assistant professor, associate professor or professor. Unfortunately, one of the nominees (James Lowe) is a lecturer. In order to comply with the Student Conduct Program (WAC 106-120-051) p. 28 of Student Handbook, the Executive Committee nominated Roger Winters as a replacement.

The Senate approved the Executive Committee's nomination of Roger Winters to serve on the Campus Judicial Council.

2. Con Potter met with the Executive Committee to determine the procedure for Senate action on the elementary education program proposal that was excluded from consideration at the June, 1972 meeting. It was suggested that he arrange with the Senate Curriculum Committee for this matter to be brought before the Senate.
3. The Chairman met with Neil Gillam to discuss the Interim Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on Conditions of Faculty Employment. Mr. Gillam was

in substantial agreement with the following report by the Executive Committee:

The Senate Executive Committee recognizes the extreme breadth of the charges directed to the Ad Hoc Committee on Conditions of Faculty Employment. These charges will be redirected to appropriate existing committees where possible. Accordingly, the Executive Committee dismisses the Ad Hoc Committee on Conditions of Faculty Employment with appreciation for its Interim Report.

One specific charge as originally stated by the Chairman of the Faculty Senate on October 14, 1970 does not fall clearly within the province of an existing committee, namely: "Examination of the current contract relationship between the College and non-tenured faculty. (This could include part-time employees as well). What should be the nature and content of employment contracts? In this regard, the committee could study other contractual conditions that may affect taxes; e.g., if research is required as a condition of employment, the unreimbursed costs are unquestionably deductible."

The Executive Committee charges the Senate Personnel Committee to review the substance of the above charge and bring a recommendation to the Senate for the disposition of said charge.

4. The matter of determining the eligibility for tenure for Dean Burton Williams was brought to the Committee by Vice-President Harrington. Specifically, the Faculty Code indicates that the required probationary period for tenure for persons asked to assume administrative duties prior to achieving tenure as teaching faculty shall be determined by the Vice President in consultation with the Faculty Senate.

After discussing the time Mr. Williams has been on campus (3 years, now in his fourth) the Committee brings to the Senate the following motion:

MOTION NO. 869: Ken Berry moved, seconded by Chester Keller, that Burton Williams be recognized as having satisfied the required probationary period for tenure at the end of this academic year. The motion was passed with a unanimous voice vote.

5. At the Faculty meeting of October 10 the Chairman was asked what vote would be necessary to overturn the Senate's approval of Senate Motion No. 852-- "Rules Governing the Board of Academic Appeals." The Chairman discussed Section II M of the Faculty Code with the Code Committee. The Code Committee agreed unanimously that a majority of eligible faculty must vote negatively in order to overturn the Senate action.

MOTION NO. 870: Ken Berry moved, seconded by Rosco Tolman, that the Senate interpret Section II, M, of the Code as follows: An unfavorable vote by a majority of faculty eligible to vote shall be required to reverse the Senate action.

The Chairman reviewed the Code in relation to this matter. Specifically, Section XIII of the previous Code had been amended in 1970 so that amendments are approved by "a simple majority of the faculty voting" while the section pertaining to review by the faculty (II.M) has not been amended: "An unfavorable vote by the majority of the faculty shall be required to reverse the Faculty Senate action." Also, the Chairman reported on the precedent in which Senate Motion No. 333 was reviewed. In this instance, the review was decided by a majority of the faculty voting.

Mr. Keller asked the status of the ballots.

Mr. Chrismer said they were still sealed.

Mr. Keller said he would ask for a revote if the motion were passed.

Mr. Leavitt said he would be happy to accept the majority of those voting since the Senate could reconsider the proposal for the Board of Academic Appeals.

MOTION NO. 871: Robert Jacobs moved, seconded by Don Cocheba, that Motion No. 870 be amended: The Senate interpret Section II, M. of the Code as follows: An unfavorable vote by the majority of the faculty voting shall be required to reverse the Senate action.

There was considerable discussion as to which of the interpretations was proper.

Motion No. 871 to amend Motion No. 870 passed by a roll call vote:

Aye: Betty Trout, Calvin Willberg, Lynn Osborn, Betty Hileman, Thomas Thelen, Gordon Leavitt, Zolton Kramar, Daryl Basler, Catherine Sands, Darwin Goodey, Chester Keller, John Vifian, Richard Fairbanks, Duncan McQuarrie, Donald Cocheba, Robert Jones, Lee Fisher, David Canzler, James Nylander, Robert Jacobs and Pete Martinez.

Nay: Jim Applegate, Charles McGehee, James Brooks, Arthur Ladd, Rosco Tolman, John Purcell, John Chrismer, Kenneth Berry and Jerry Jones.

Abstain: Louis Bovos, Roger Ferguson, and David Anderson.

Discussion proceeded on Motion No. 870 as amended.

Mr. Ladd spoke against the motion, saying if the motion carries a small number can cancel the action of the Senate, although he feels if the action of the Senate is to be reversed, a majority of the entire faculty should be opposed.

Mr. Keller spoke for the motion, stating this would not allow a small percentage of faculty to uphold a Senate action when the total number of votes is small.

Mr. Brooks recalled the history of the Code as it pertained to the section on Review by Faculty (II.M.). He felt that the motion on the floor would not be an interpretation of the Code, but a Code change instead.

The Chairman was asked if this motion would affect balloting which might occur in future reviews.

The Chairman said the original motion as presented by the Executive Committee was to ask the Senate to interpret the Code. Accordingly, the motion as amended would be added to the interpretations which are appended to the Faculty Code.

MOTION NO. 872: Mr. Nylander moved, seconded by Mr. Fisher, to table the motion at this time and call on the Code Committee and the Executive Committee to meet on this matter.

A roll call vote was called for.

Aye: John Purcell, James Nylander, Lee Fisher, James Brooks, Arthur Ladd, Donald Cocheba, John Chrismer, Roger Ferguson, Kenneth Berry, Catherine Sands, Louis Bovos, Jim Applegate, Betty Trout, Calvin Willberg, Jerry Jones, Duncan McQuarrie, Richard Fairbanks, Betty Hileman, Darwin Goodey, and Zolton Kramar.

Nay: Robert Jones, Daryl Basler, John Vifian, Chester Keller, Lynn Osborn, Charles McGehee, David Canzler, Pete Martinez, Rosco Tolman, Robert Jacobs, Thomas Thelen and Gordon Leavitt.

Abstain: David Anderson

Motion No. 872 carried and the Code Committee and the Executive Committee will meet to discuss this matter.

B. Budget Committee--Jerry Jones commented briefly on the fact that since Social Security will go up on January 1 and insurance rates had gone up, very little benefit in take home pay would be received from the pay raise received by the faculty.

C. Code Committee--Robert Jacobs reported that the Code Committee is engaged in studying President Brooks's comments on the proposed Code. The Code Committee will have a report in time for the next Faculty Senate meeting.

Mr. Brooks explained that the comments communicated to the Senate had been written after conferring with the Trustees individually. Also, the Board had approved the comments, so the comments reflect the attitude of the Board accurately.

In response to a suggestion of a breakdown in communications between the Board and the Code Committee, Mr. Lawrence explained that most of the concerns of the Board had reached the Code Committee and some suggested changes were incorporated into the proposed Code while others were rejected after Code hearings.

Mr. Jacobs said it seemed to be the consensus of the Code Committee that the only advantage to the faculty in the proposed Code was the earlier dates

for notifying untenured faculty of their reappointment. A great many of the changes suggested in the memo seemed to be contrary to the faculty's interest. The Senators should study these very carefully.

- D. Curriculum Committee--Joel Andress reported that a Memorandum had been circulated to the Senators with the recommended curriculum proposals which had been approved.

MOTION NO. 873: Mr. Osborn moved, seconded by Chester Keller, for the Senate approval of:

1. The A.C.C.C. approved proposals:
 - a. P. 240, in entirety
 - b. P. 244-46, with the exception of:
 - 1) P.E. 352.1, 352.2, 352.3 Course Addition
 - 2) Sp. & Dr. 253 Course Addition
 - c. P. 248 in entirety
 - d. P. 250 in entirety
2. The Graduate Council approved proposals:
 - a. Graduate Council, P. 6, Bus. Ed. Course Number Change and Music Credit Changes only;
 - b. Deletion of the following M.Ed. programs
 - 1) M.Ed. Biology
 - 2) M.Ed. Jr. High Broad Area
 - 3) M.Ed. Speech Pathology and Audiology
 - 4) M.Ed. Chemistry
 - 5) M.Ed. History

Mr. Leavitt said he would like to delay the vote on this until next meeting so the Senate can look through the pages being considered. He suggested the Curriculum Committee's report be published with the Agenda so the Senators can be ready for acting on the report.

Motion No. 873 was voted on and carried with Mr. Leavitt, Mr. Anderson, Mr. Berry, Mr. Jones and Mr. Cocheba abstaining.

- E. Personnel Committee--no report at this meeting.

- F. Student Affairs Committee--no report at this meeting.

- G. Report of the Ad Hoc Committee to Study Reorganization of College Governance--Mr. Lawrence distributed copies of the Charter of the College Council to the Senate members. He pointed out that it was not being offered for consideration at this meeting. He requested that the proposal for College Council be placed on the Agenda at a special meeting or early on the Agenda at the next meeting of the Senate. He pointed out significant sections in the Charter and explained them to the Senators.

MOTION NO. 874: Mr. McGehee moved, seconded by Mr. Vifian, to hold a Special Senate Meeting on November 15 to discuss the Charter of the College Council. The motion passed with a unanimous voice vote.

- H. Report of the Council of Faculty Representatives--Ken Harsha discussed the Summary of Suggested Faculty Retirement Improvements which was sent out to the Senators.

President Brooks announced that the retirement program is explained in the Faculty Handbook on pages 78, 79, and 80 and he suggested the Senators read the state law that applies.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 6:15 p.m.

AGENDA
FACULTY SENATE MEETING
4 p.m., Wednesday, November 1, 1972
Room 123, Hertz Hall

- I. ROLL CALL
- II. AGENDA CHANGES AND APPROVAL
- III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES OF OCTOBER 4, 1972
- IV. COMMUNICATIONS
 - A. Memorandum from R. M. Frye
 - B. Memorandum from Luther Baker
 - C. Memorandum from E. Smith Murphy, Jr.
- V. REPORTS
 - A. Executive Committee
 - 1. Report of Vice Chairman
 - B. Standing Committees
 - 1. Budget
 - 2. Code
 - 3. Curriculum
 - 4. Personnel
 - 5. Student Affairs
 - C. Ad Hoc Committees
 - 1. Committee to Study Reorganization of College Governance
 - D. Council of Faculty Representatives
 - 1. Report on retirement program
- VI. OLD BUSINESS
- VII. NEW BUSINESS
- VIII. ADJOURNMENT

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF

11/1/72

ROLL CALL

☒ Anderson, David
☒ Willberg, Calvin
☒ Applegate, Jim
☒ Basler, Daryl
☒ Berry, Kenneth
☒ Bovos, Louis
☒ Brooks, James
☒ Canzler, David
☒ Chrismer, John
Dunning, Bill
Farkas, Steven
☒ Fisher, Lee
Gillam, Cornelius
☒ Goodey, Darwin
☒ Hileman, Betty
☒ Jacobs, Robert
☒ Jones, Jerry
☒ Jones, Robert
☒ Keller, Chester
☒ Kramar, Zolton
☒ Ladd, Arthur
☒ Leavitt, Gordon
☒ McGehee, Charles
☒ McQuarrie, Duncan
☒ Nylander, James
Owens, B. Dean
☒ Purcell, John
☒ Osborn, Lynn
☒ Sands, Catherine
Shadle, Owen
☒ Thelen, Thomas
☒ Tolman, Rosco
☒ Trout, Betty
☒ Vifian, John

Cooper, Bill
Cushman, Jim
☒ Ferguson, Roger

Frederick Lister
Otto Jakubek
Frank Carlson
Art Keith
Raymond Wiman
James Hollister
Edward Harrington
Richard Johnson
Marie Madison
☒ Richard Fairbanks
Robert Bentley

☒ Donald Cocheba
James Klahn

Charles Stastny
David Lygre
Charles Vleck
Jay Bachrach
Gordon Warren
Willard Sperry
John DeMerchant
William Benson
Frank Nelson
John Pearson
Eileen Calkins
John Foster
Milo Smith
Marco Bicchieri
☒ Pete Martinez
Glen Clark
Nancy Lester
Pearl Douce
Bruce Teets

Carl Olson

VISITORS

PLEASE SIGN THIS SHEET

Faculty Senate Meeting

Ronald Phelps

Len Lanta

Pearl Ponce

Joel M. Andrews

Ray L. Lawrence

Dale R. Cornstock

Beverly Heckart

Philip S. Hann

Anthony Canedo

Edward J. Harrington

W. Dugmore

Last person signing please return to the Recording Secretary.

RANDOM
CALL VOTE

Motion No. 876

Senator

AYE

NAY

ABSTAIN

Bovos, Louis			✓	James Hollister
Applegate, Jim		✓		Frank Carlson
Trout, Betty	✓			Pearl Douce'
Ferguson, Roger			✓	Carl Olson
Willberg, Calvin	✓			Otto Jakubek
Cooper, Bill				Carl Olson
Osborn, Lynn	✓			Milo Smith
Hileman, Betty	✓			
McGehee, Charles	✓	✓		William Benson
Thel n. Thomas	✓			Glen Clark
Leavitt, Gordon	✓			John DeMerchant
Brooks, James		✓		Edward Harrington
Kramar, Zolton	✓			Gordon Warren
Basler, Daryl	✓			Art Keith
Sands, Catherine	✓			Marco Bicchieri
Cushman, Jim				Carl Olson
Goodey, Darwin	✓			James Klahn
Dunning, Bill	✓			Richard Fairbanks
Keller, Chester	✓			Jay Bachrach
W.ian, John	✓			Bruce Teets
Ladd, Arthur		✓		Willard Sperry
McQuarrie, Duncan	✓			Frank Nelson
Farkas, Steven				Robert Bentley
Gillam, Cornelius	✓			Donald Cocheba
Anderson, David.			✓	Frederick Lister
Jones, Robert	✓			Charles Vleck
Fisher, Lee	✓			
Tolman, Rosco		✓		Nancy Lester
Canzler, David	✓			Richard Johnson
Purcell, John		✓		John Foster
Owens, B. Dean				Eileen Calkins
Chrismer, John		✓		Marie Madison
Nylander, James	✓			John Pearson
Berry, Kenneth		✓		Raymond Wiman
Jacobs, Robert	✓			Charles Stastny
Jones, Jerry		✓		David Lygre
Shadle, Owen	✓			✓ Pete Martinez

21

9

3

RANDOM
ROLL CALL VOTE

Motion No. 877

Senator

AYE

NAY

ABSTAIN

Purcell, John	✓		John Foster
Cushman, Jim			Carl Olson
Nylander, James	✓		John Pearson
Anderson, David		✓	Frederick Lister
Fisher, Lee	✓		
Brooks, James	✓		Edward Harrington
Jones, Robert		✓	Charles Vlcek
Ladd, Arthur	✓		Willard Sperry
Basler, Daryl		✓	Art Keith
Sillam, Cornelius	✓		Donald Cocheba
Parkas, Steven			Robert Bentley
Vifian, John		✓	Bruce Teets
Chrismer, John	✓		Marie Madison
Keller, Chester		✓	Jay Bachrach
Osborn, Lynn		✓	Milo Smith
McGehee, Charles		✓	William Benson
Canzler, David		✓	Richard Johnson
Ferguson, Roger	✓		Carl Olson
Berry, Kenneth	✓		Raymond Wiman
Quens, B. Dean			Eileen Calkins
Waddle, Owen		✓	Pete Martinez
Sands, Catherine	✓		Marco Bicchieri
Tolman, Rosco		✓	Nancy Lester
Bovos, Louis	✓		James Hollister
Applegate, Jim	✓		Frank Carlson
Trout, Betty	✓		Pearl Douce
Willberg, Calvin	✓		Otto Jakubek
Jones, Jerry	✓		David Lygre
Cooper, Bill			Carl Olson
Jacobs, Robert		✓	Charles Stastny
McQuarrie, Duncan	✓		Frank Nelson
Dunning, Bill	✓		Richard Fairbanks
Thelen, Thomas		✓	Glen Clark
Hileman, Betty	✓		
Leavitt, Gordon		✓	John DeMerchant
Goodey, Darwin	✓		James Klahn
Kramar, Zolton	✓		Gordon Warren

20

12

1

MEMORANDUM

TO: David Anderson, Chairman, Faculty Senate

FROM: R. M. Pryor, Chairman, Dept. of Technology & Ind. Education

DATE: October 10, 1972

RE: Faculty Senate Alternate

Due to circumstances, our alternate in the department of Technology and Industrial Education will be unable to attend the regularly scheduled Faculty Senate meetings. Therefore, the department held a special election on Tuesday, October 10, 1972 and elected Dr. Pete Martinez as alternate to replace Mr. Gerald Brunner.

RM:pm

TO: John Chrismer
Secretary, Faculty Senate

FROM: Dr. Luther Baker *L.B.*

DATE: October 17, 1972

RE: Faculty Senate Membership

³ On Monday, October 16, 1972 the department of Home Economics elected Dr. Pearl Douce¹ as alternate member to the Faculty Senate.

LGB:vmga

MEMORANDUM

TO: John Chrismer
Secretary, Faculty Senate

FROM: E. Smith Murphy, Jr. *E. Smith Murphy, Jr.*
Chairman, Department of Physics

DATE: October 13, 1972

RE: Alternate senator from the Department of Physics

At a staff meeting held October 13, 1972, Willard C. Sperry was unanimously elected alternate senator from the Department of Physics to serve for the remaining year of the term to which Bryan E. Gore was originally elected.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON
98926

October 25, 1972

Dr. David R. Anderson
Chairman, Faculty Senate
Central Washington State College
Ellensburg

Dear Dr. Anderson:

Section IX, B 1 of the Faculty Code (Revised, 1970) states:

Persons whose duties combine administration with part-time teaching, or those asked to assume administrative duties prior to achieving tenure as teaching faculty shall be considered for tenure eligibility only upon recommendation by the Vice President. The required probationary period for tenure in such instances shall be determined by the Vice President in consultation with the Faculty Senate.

Dr. Burton L. Williams has, as you know, assumed the role of Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences on July 1, 1972. He is in his fourth year at Central, three of which were in the Department of History. Dr. Williams is currently teaching in the Department of History in addition to carrying his duties as Dean.

I would recommend that Dr. Williams be considered for tenure through the normal procedures this fall as any person in their fourth year.

Would you please consult with the Senate to see if they concur.

Sincerely,

Edward J. Harrington
Vice President for Academic Affairs

cc: Dr. Kelling

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

98926

October 25, 1972

RECEIVED

OCT 26 1972

FACULTY SENATE

Professor David Anderson
Chairman, Faculty Senate
CWSC

Dear David:

Because of pressing personal and professional burdens this year, I will be unable to continue as Senator from the Geography Department. I therefore submit to you my resignation, to take effect on October 31st. At its most recent meeting on October 20, the Geography Department elected Calvin Willberg as its new Senator.

I regret that I cannot complete my term in the Senate as it has been an interesting and educational experience.

Sincerely,



Joel M. Andress

CC Martin Kaatz

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF GEOGRAPHY

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

October 24, 1972

Chairman
Faculty Senate
CAMPUS

RECEIVED

OCT 25 1972

FACULTY SENATE


Dear Sir:

Following the resignation of Joel Address as Faculty Senator, an election was held in the Department of Geography. The following two people were elected to serve for the remainder of Address' term:

Calvin G. Willberg - Senator

Otto F. Jakubek - Alternate

Sincerely,


Martin R. Kaatz
Chairman

MRK:lj1

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

ELLensburg, WASHINGTON
99001

August 18, 1972

Dr. David R. Anderson, Chairman
Faculty Senate
Campus

Dear Dave:

Your two letters dated July 24, 1972, and the comparisons you and Don Ringe, Chairman of the Code Committee, made of the present and proposed Faculty Code, were most welcome and timely. I used them for reference as I revised my previous comments on the proposed Code, consulting individually with members of the Board of Trustees. A copy of my latest comments is included for your study.

I do not know all of the suggestions the trustees made last year individually and collectively to Don Ringe, Gordon Leavitt, the Code Committee and the Faculty Senate Executive Committee regarding the proposed Code. As you know, I was not in attendance at all of the meetings and discussions. I will rely on individual trustees to contact you and Don Ringe personally if they wish to document the concerns they have expressed. However, I wish to point out that as far as I can determine, none of the trustees have expressed objection to any of my revised comments. They strongly support and indeed, have influenced my statements, on the following:

1. faculty hearing and grievance committee
2. faculty load
3. salary adjustments
4. notice requirement for non-reappointment
5. academic year--defined
6. amendments to Code
7. sabbatical leave
8. verification by a licensed physician
9. summer school appointments

As you know, items 1 and 3 have been discussed during board meetings the past year. Individual members of the Board made their positions clear on these matters.

After you review the comments, may I suggest that we meet together to discuss how we can resolve some of these differences.

Sincerely,

James E. Brooks
President

Enclosure

cc: Trustees
Dr. Ring
Faculty Senate Executive Committee
Dr. Harrington

BROCKS, August 18, 1972
(Revision of comments
sent on 11/29/71 to Code
Committee, Trustees,
Faculty Senate Executive
Committee)

COMMENTS ON
THE PROPOSED FACULTY CODE

SECTION I
PAGES 1-15

PAGE

- 1 1.01 and 1.05: Faculty - Defined, and rights and privileges.
(a) Once again, part-time Faculty and all other non-Civil Service employees, including graduate students, are not covered by this Code. They should be covered by the Faculty Handbook. The 1972 Handbook should be specific about this. In addition, an administrative Code must be written, especially for non-Faculty, non-Civil Service employees. This has been started.
- 1 1.03: Academic year - Defined.
(a) This leaves many questions unanswered. Apparently the Code Committee thought that the academic year begins with the day of registration in the fall and ends with the last day of finals in the spring. But what is a "regular quarter?" May the President require faculty or student orientation prior to the beginning of instruction in the fall? during finals week? for registration prior to instruction before any quarter? exactly what is the obligation of Faculty for time on the job between September 1 and July 1?
- 2 1.25: Faculty Senate - Membership
(a) Professional employees in counseling and testing should be considered as a separate department for the purpose of election of senators.
- 9-11 1.100 through 1.120: Faculty Hearing and Grievance Committees
(a) These are entirely new sections and constitute very important additions. Reportedly, they follow AAUP procedures and have been developed to assure due process.
(b) However, with regard to the hearing and settling of conflicts and disputes, the College must follow a process that is fair, efficient, legal, simple and streamlined. The process must not be too elaborate and time-consuming, too costly in dollars, and too risky (legally and professionally) for administration, faculty and trustees. The process must be complete, as it affords true due process.

- (c) In critical cases the proposed Hearing Committee may need its own attorney and a professional to transcribe the record. In addition, it may face two attorneys--one for the College and one for the faculty member who is citing the grievance. Who will bear these high costs? Given the present legal aspects of college operation, can the committee "function always in a quasi-judicial capacity"---(see 1.110-4, page 10)? Should (or can) the Committee "develop rules and procedures for the conduct of any hearing which seem advisable to it" (see 1.110-6, page 10)? What if legal due process conflicts with "concepts of fundamental fairness appropriate to an academic community" (1.110-6, page 10)?
- (d) The lengthy process being recommended, which may include hearings by at least two groups of faculty members prior to submission to the President and the Trustees (note the option provided in 1.120-2 for the faculty member to appeal to both committees) will be costly in faculty and administrative time, as well as in dollars. There are broad responsibilities assigned to the Hearing Committee (see 1.110-3, page 10). Involvement of the college administrators must be substantial, thus their workloads will increase substantially. Unless the process is strengthened (see (c) above), increasing time and costs even more, testimony and records may be challenged, the Hearing Committee members may find themselves subject to lawsuit, and the President and Trustees may have little confidence in the results. Being open to lawsuit themselves, they may be forced to conduct new investigations and hearings. Items 3.95-3 (m), page 40, and 3.100, page 41, open the way to appeals to the Trustees and new hearings sponsored by them, and Faculty Hearing Committee results are not binding (3.95-3-(c), page 41). A lawyer can argue that the results of hearings sponsored by the board should not be accepted for the trustees and their agents are "biased" after months of faculty hearings.
- (e) The statement on the powers and duties of the Grievance Committee (page 11) fails to recognize the need for grievances to be processed through administrative channels (department chairmen, etc.). See Human Rights procedures for examples of this; also Civil Service Grievance procedures. The statement in 1.120 (2) opens the Committee to hear "any matters whatever." The Faculty Grievance Committee could very well have a tremendous workload.

- (F) What is needed, possibly, instead of this system, is a highly competent hearing officer and a set of standard procedures for hearings that assure due process and fairness. This system could be streamlined and decisive so that it may resolve conflicts as quickly as possible. This system would give maximum legal protection for all. This type of system is currently being used by the college trustees.

12 1.145: Review by Faculty (of Senate actions)

- (a) This change gives faculty much more time (at least six weeks) to challenge a senate action.
- (b) In such cases, the Senate takes the original action, not the President. Therefore, the Senate should react first to a written petition by ten per cent of the faculty. If the Senate refuses to reverse its position, then the President should be required to call a special faculty meeting.
- (c) The senate authority to represent the whole faculty is eroded when only one half of those voting can change a senate action. This is a significant change from the required one half of the faculty.

13-14 1.155 and 1.176: Meetings of the Senate, and Records

- (a) Senate meetings cannot be closed, or the number of observers limited, unless the college trustees approve a rule to that effect.
- (b) Rule needed here, too, for records of "informal hearings." These are the only records that can be restricted by the Senate or its Chairman, by Board rule.

14-15 1.175: Amendments to the Code

- (a) As before, there is no procedure for the Trustees to amend or revise the Code by its own authority, and the Code remains a "timeless contract." The only addition proposed is that the Trustees may suggest code changes to the Senate. However, changes may be submitted for final consideration by only one party--the faculty.
- (b) Who is to interpret this Code? How are interpretations initiated and approved?

SECTION II
PAGES 15-30

PAGE

- 15 2.05: Academic Rank
 (a) Add Counseling and Testing to paragraph 1.
 (b) The elimination of acting rank limits administrative and departmental options in appointments at a time when many options are needed.
- 16 2.10: Minimum Qualifications for Academic Rank
 (a) For some time now most state colleges have been requiring the doctorate for initial appointment in those fields where the doctorate is normally expected, and they have required it for tenure and promotion to the associate and professor ranks. We should do the same, and we are in many departments, allowing for exceptions to be proposed, as per the introductory paragraph. Also, the doctorate should be defined according to U.S. accrediting standards, here and elsewhere in the Code.
 (b) 2.10 (4) (b). These four items should be renumbered as follows: (i), (iv), (iii), (ii). Teaching, research and public service are recognized as our principle duties. This revised arrangement would compliment the promotions in rank statement (2.20).
 (c) There is some restriction on hiring by having a requirement to place all prospective faculty in their appropriate ranks. Special appointments become a problem (retired persons, etc.)
- 17 2.15: Lecturers - rights, privileges and limitations
 (a) If lecturers are "irregular appointments", do they qualify as faculty under 1.01, "Faculty defined?" This section or 1.01 should be clarified.
 (b) 2.15 (4). According to state law, employees of the college may be appointed by the trustees without recommendation from others being a requirement. The same holds true for 2.15 (6); the trustees may determine appointments without being limited by others.
- 19 2.30: Procedure for determining promotions
 (a) Item (2), line two, change President to Vice President for Academic Affairs.

20-21 2.40: Faculty Load

- (a) Suggest changing this to "the average teaching load of members of the faculty for the academic year shall be a minimum of twelve non-extension credit hours per week or its equivalent. The maximum load shall be 18 credit hours per week, including extension credits."
- (b) Change to "instructional and research responsibilities, subject to the authority of the Vice President for Academic Affairs."

21-22 2.45: Salary Adjustments

- (a) One must agree with the Code Committee Chairman: "No change here, but this section cries for modification."
- (b) Why should there be restrictions on upward salary adjustments and why should the Senate approve exceptions to restrictions (introductory paragraph)? Administrators and trustees should have this authority.
- (c) Once again it is proposed that all faculty members, regardless of their performance, be awarded equally by having increases in the basic salary scale take first priority over any increases for individuals; to this is added the third priority which is general increments, again awarded to every faculty member who is not salaried at the top of his rank (or rank plus overlap). Special increments ("merit increases") are the very last.
- (d) Suggest a change to these priorities: (1) promotions, (2) merit increases subject to administrative judgment, (3) scale adjustments, and (4) special salary increases to last only until one is promoted.

24 2.60: Basic salary scale

- (a) Item (3). The board has the authority under state law to change salary scales without prior consultation. They cannot delegate this authority.

24-27 2.65 through 2.95: Sabbatical Leave

- (a) OWSC was requested to have its sabbatical leave policies conform to the state guidelines (Council on Higher Education, etc.) by September 1, 1971. Item 2.95, page 27, does not comply fully with the new guidelines regarding replacements, and funding above the 50% level is almost impossible, because the new guidelines require workloads to be maintained. The Board of Trustees is reluctant to approve sabbaticals funded above the 50% level, given these problems. We should change to 50%.

- (b) Also, 2.95 should read, "should be presented to the President of the College and the Board of Trustees for final approval."

27-29 2.105: Disability Leave

- (a) 2.105 (5) and 2.120 (2). Under normal circumstances, the College should have the right to require verification by a licensed physician it chooses. This would clarify the matter and eliminate occasional problems.
- (b) 2.120 (3). After due consideration the administration should have the option to cancel the individual's courses. At present this section may be interpreted to require overload payments.

29 2.125: Retirement

- (a) Retirement is changed to August 31. 70 age retirement is no longer mandatory.

-7-

SECTION III
PAGES 30-44

PAGE

- 30 3.05: Appointment of Department Chairmen
(a) In some cases the administration should or must appoint a chairman, or an acting chairman. This should be provided for.
- 31 3.20: Appointments - minimum qualifications
(a) Again, the doctorate, not the master's degree, is now the minimum expectation for appointment. See comment above under 2.10 (a). Exceptions can be made.
- 31 3.25: Appointment - termination by faculty member
(a) Change April 15 to April 1, to conform with the change in 3.40 from April 1 to March 1 (in other words, 30 days after new administrative deadline in 3.40)
- 31 3.30: Appointment - full disclosure
(a) This section places an unreasonable burden on the administration - and one that is unnecessary, if 3.25 is in effect.
- 31 3.35: Appointment - termination by faculty member
(a) Mark out "or other opportunity" at end of paragraph.
- 31 3.40: Non-reappointment - notice requirements
(a) These are significant changes, placing new requirements on the administration and trustees. They are AAUP guidelines:

	<u>Present Code</u>	<u>Proposed Code</u>
First year	3 months in advance	March 1 (or 3 mos.)
Second year	February 1 of second year	December 15 of second year (or at least 6 months)
Third year	end of fall quarter	12 months in advance after two years

In other words, the College would be required either to release a faculty member, or hire him for a full third year, after he has been at OWSC only four quarters. If the person is appointed for this third year, then the administration must give him 12 months notice from then on.
The present dates may be sufficient.

32-33 3.50 and 3.55: Non-Reappointment--Academic Freedom--notice of reasons--review

- (a) There is no argument against the concept of a grievance committee. However, this grievance committee is open to hours and hours of hearing complaints that have not been processed through channels; administration and faculty workloads are greatly increased and the administration may be forced to reveal the private personnel evaluations that have been submitted to it. Note 2.30, 3.45 and 3.90--the methods this proposed code establishes to evaluate faculty--private evaluations are an important part of the processes.

33-34 3.60 and 3.65: Summer School Appointments

- (a) More timely dates are included here.
- (b) Appointment to teach in summer school should be decided on the needs of the College, instead of "the program requirements of the respective departments." Outsiders should be hired when necessary to attract enrollment. 3.60 (2) is unacceptable for summer school appointment.
- (c) In 3.60 (2), last sentence, there is no need to include the President of the College.
- (d) Comment: Summer school employment will have to be based on whether or not enrollment materializes by a certain date. This should be accommodated in the Code; without it, curriculum flexibility, enrollments and budgets can be adversely affected for summer, as they have been in 1971 and 1972 (losses of \$89,000 and \$52,000 respectively.)

34 3.70: Termination of Appointments

- (a) 3.70 (3). The trustees should not be required to review and decide all such cases. Also, shouldn't 3.70 be a part of 3.40, and conform to same dates for release as 3.70 (3)?
- (b) The college should be able to release a faculty member to accept another job elsewhere, and should not have to pay 12 months salary if a released faculty member secures another job.

- (c) 3.78 (4). Medical evidence is mentioned only twice before in this proposed code, in connection with disability leaves (2.105). The College should be able to require that medical evidence be obtained directly from physicians the College selects in this state. The faculty member should be required to arrange for the provision of such evidence.

35-36 3.88: Eligibility for Tenure

- (a) The authority of the trustees in awarding tenure cannot be limited by departmental approval of tenure proposals.

36-37 3.85: Acquisition of Tenure--probationary periods

- (a) 3.85 (1). The notice requirements (3.40) must be read with this section. If the College allows a person to complete four years, he has tenure if he is not notified; however, the College must notify him before the end of his third year if he is to be reappointed for 12 months, and then allow him another 12 months employment if he does not receive tenure. His employment period, then, is five years minimum after three years. In addition, the four year period of association with the College should be defined (does leave count?).
- (b) 3.85 (2) and (4). The Board's authority to grant tenure cannot be limited by departmental approval requirements.
- (c) 3.85 (5). Such faculty should be permitted to apply for time for tenure. Often their appointments are very limited in nature of duties. Again, departmental approval constitutes a limit to board authority.

37 3.95: Dismissal Procedures

- (a) 3.95 (1). What if a faculty member is fit in his professional capacity but is insubordinate? found guilty of a very serious crime? Will the Faculty Hearing Committee determine whether a faculty member is violating professional standards or exercising his academic freedom?
- (b) 3.95 (3) (a). Add: "to the last address given by the faculty member to the college."

- (c) 3.95 (3) (b). May either party request and be granted an open hearing under these circumstances? Should be checked with the Attorney General.
- (d) 3.95 (3) (c) and (e). The Committee will want its own legal counsel, and professional help must be hired to record the proceedings. This will be costly in dollars and time.
- (e) 3.95 (3) (j). This is unnecessarily restrictive-- change shall to may. It is assumed that other faculty members includes other administrative faculty. This should be stated.
- (f) 3.95 (3) (k). Take out "except as otherwise provided."
- (g) 3.95 (3) (k). If the Trustees and others are to accept the findings, shouldn't the Committee be bound by the strict rules of legal evidence, especially in view of 3.95 (3) (l) and 3.95 (3) (c)?

41 3.100: Dismissal procedure - action by the Trustees

- (a) 3.100 (2). Accepting a resignation without prejudice limits the college unnecessarily. What if the Hearing Committee agrees that the faculty member is guilty of fraud? theft? dereliction of duties? The Board cannot accept a resignation without prejudice and then attempt to collect college losses from the guilty faculty member. How does the College handle requests for references?

41 3.105: Suspension

- (a) Strike: "only if immediate harm to himself or others is threatened by his continuance."

42 3.110: Terminal Salary or notice

- (a) Dismissal for cause, being a most serious matter, should not be rewarded with 12 months of salary. Also, there may be a question about whether a dismissed faculty member can be paid while not performing services for the state.

42 3.115: Grievance Procedure

- (a) Those who have grievances should use the administrative remedies open to them before they are allowed to petition a Grievance Committee, the Senate Executive Committee and "appropriate administrators. Under this system one person can demand far too much valuable time from many busy people.

RECEIVED

OCT 12 1972 CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

FACULTY

October 12, 1972

To: Members of the Faculty Senate

From: President Brooks

Re: May 29, 1972 Report of the Ad Hoc Committee on
Conditions of Faculty Employment

On two occasions now the Faculty Senate office has circulated to all Senators an interim report from the Ad Hoc Committee on conditions of Faculty Employment. The report is dated May 29, 1972, and is authored by C.W. Gillam, Chairman of the Committee.

I wish to suggest that all members of the Senate read this report carefully and then compare its content with the laws of the State of Washington concerning higher education and this College. A section entitled "Selected Statutes", included in this year's Faculty Handbook, may be used to make this comparison. Reference should also be made to the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure.

Let me relate here a few of my concerns about the content of the Ad Hoc Committee's report.

Dr. Gillam makes reference to a proposal made by the college administration in the winter of 1970 to "revise contracts of faculty employment" through the use of a contract form "differing in certain respects considered significant by many members of the faculty from the appointment letters previously used." The Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure, Section III. F. states: "The terms and conditions of every appointment shall be stated in writing and shall be in the possession of both the College and the faculty member before the appointment is consummated. A copy of the Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure shall accompany each letter of appointment." The proposed contract form of 1970 was an attempt to fulfill the requirements of the Faculty Code so that each individual faculty member would have in his possession, as well as an original appointment letter, a contract stating the terms and conditions of employment. The proposed contract form was not an attempt to "rewrite the contract of faculty members", but merely an attempt to put into written form the actual terms and conditions of each faculty member's employment at Central Washington State College. The contract form was withdrawn because there was misunderstanding about its content not because its

content was "illegal." In my estimation, a printed contract is still needed to meet the requirements of the Code and to prevent the administration from accidentally omitting certain employment conditions.

Dr. Gillam in his memorandum cited with concern an incorporation by reference into the contract: "applicable rules, regulations and orders which have been or may hereafter be periodically adopted by the Board of Trustees of the College, and other pertinent administrative policies or practices of the College." Dr. Gillam stated that: "Many members of the faculty, myself included, felt that this proposed faculty contract would substantially change the existing contractual relationship between the College and each individual member of the faculty, would give the administration unilateral power to amend faculty contracts through Board action or mere modification of administrative policies or practices, and would violate the provisions of the Faculty Code and the AAUP standards calling for full and complete written statement of the terms and conditions of faculty employment." Again I remind you that it was the purpose of the 1970 proposed contract form to set forth in writing the terms and conditions of employment as they were and are today. That language was included in the contract form because each and every faculty member employed by Central Washington State College must abide by all applicable rules, regulations and orders which have been adopted by the Board of Trustees or which may be adopted by the Board of Trustees. The legislature has authorized, in RCW 28B.40.120 (11), the Board to "promulgate such rules and regulations, and perform all other acts not forbidden by law, as the board of trustees may in its discretion deem necessary or appropriate to the administration of the college."

The Board of Trustees adopts new policy, amends or repeals old policies at almost every meeting. Every session, the legislature adopts new laws and makes new requirements upon state colleges necessitating changes in their operation. Most recently the College has adopted new policies which will affect members of the public, faculty, students, and administration. Even though a faculty member was employed and became tenured prior to the adoption of a particular policy, that policy must be adhered to as part of the faculty member's employment responsibility. Examples of such policies are as follows: the human rights policy, the practice and procedure hearing officer policy of the Board of Trustees for the conduct of formal hearings, admission charges for academic programs, the use of computer facilities policy, student publications policy, business enterprise policy, scheduling center policy, use of college facilities policy regarding motor pool use, telephone services, check-cashing policies, use of college mailing and stationery services, rules and regulations related to college and student housing, admission and registration procedures,

bid procedures, to name a few. There are policies which are going to be considered for adoption at the October 13th board meeting which may affect a faculty member's employment relationship with the College and, if adopted, will become the policy of the institution and which must be complied with. They are the Affirmative Action Policy and the policy on classwork for Central Washington State College employees.

In addition, as must be obvious to all, the laws of the state contain many stipulations that bear directly on a faculty member's employment. Note in the selected statutes the many provisions not included in the Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure (annuities and retirement income plans, insurance, authority of trustees, etc.)

There are many internal policies of the institution which must be followed by faculty members. These administrative policies or practices of the College are necessary to operate an institution of this size. As we have grown in size and structure, we have changed organization from time to time and it is necessary to change policies in order to assure the smooth and efficient operation of the institution. Under RCW 28B.40.390, the President is required by the legislature to supervise the institution.

Each time a particular administrative policy or practice has been adopted or changed, I have endeavored to make sure that such policy or change in policy did not derogate any of those rights set forth in the Faculty Code. I shall continue this administrative practice. However, the AAUP standards have not been adopted by this institution and are not applicable to its operation.

Certainly in the adoption of motor pool use rules or telephone service rules or rules regarding check-cashing in the College Bookstore, it has not been the design on the part of the administration to unilaterally exercise power with the intent of amending faculty contracts either through board action or modification of administrative policies and practices. Such policies are not developed and adopted behind closed doors, but rather are processed at open committee meetings, circulated through minutes and voted upon by faculty representatives attending President's Council or other committees. The Faculty Senate itself considers many important policies. The meetings of the Board of Trustees are conducted in open session and may be attended by anyone. Notices of these meetings are published and agendas may be obtained in the President's Office or from the Faculty Senate Chairman.

Keep in mind as you read Dr. Gillam's memo that the Faculty Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure in Section XIII. specifically sets forth the procedure by which the amendments to the Code may be made.

The Code is clear that as a matter of Board policy, an amendment to the Code of Personnel Policy and Procedure shall become effective when ratified by the faculty and approved by the Board.

The college trustees and the administration do not take deliberate action, as implied, to unilaterally modify the Faculty Code. One could inquire, of course, if Dr. Gillam's committee has investigated whether the faculty itself always honors the strict provisions of the Code; a starting place here would be a comparison of faculty teaching loads with those stipulated by the Code, a subject referred to by Dr. Gillam.

In summary, each and every faculty member as a result of his employment at Central Washington State College is subject to the state laws, the provisions of the Faculty Code, all applicable rules, regulations and orders which have been or may be adopted by the Board of Trustees of Central Washington State College and other pertinent administrative policies or practices of the College. This condition is generally the same for faculty members at all other state colleges and universities in Washington.

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

October 24, 1972

MEMORANDUM

To: Dr. David Anderson, Chairman
Faculty Senate

From: James E. Brooks, President

Re: Collective Bargaining - Proposed Statute

Attached for your information is a copy of a proposed statute on collective bargaining which will be one of many submitted to the Joint Committee on Higher Education for its consideration. This bill and others like it yet to be proposed would provide authorization for collective bargaining at institutions of higher education in the state.

The bill as written does not require collective bargaining at institutions of higher education. It merely provides the statutory authorization and some procedural guidelines for collective bargaining should a majority of a particular college's faculty decide to engage in collective bargaining. It requires recognition by the Board of Trustees of a bargaining representative to serve as the exclusive representative of all academic employees for the purpose of bargaining on questions of wages and other terms and conditions of employment. The Board of Trustees would be permitted to enter into a negotiated agreement on terms and conditions of employment. Further, the proposed bill would provide for an exception to the Open Meeting Law so that the Board of Trustees could conduct negotiations with the exclusive bargaining representative privately so as to facilitate maximum negotiation discussion.

I am submitting this proposed bill to you for your information and consideration. It is not being proposed by the Board of Trustees nor myself as an indication of our position in favor of collective bargaining, but rather it is being proposed because we do feel reasonably certain that college faculties will request permission to bargain collectively, and when that occurs, there should be specific legislation covering the ground rules of collective bargaining to facilitate rather than hinder negotiations.

Should you have any comments or concerns about this proposal, please feel free to contact me.

cc: Trustees Mr. Bohne
 Dr. Harrington Mr. Milam

Attachment

CENTRAL WASHINGTON STATE COLLEGE

DEPARTMENT OF ENGLISH

ELLENSBURG, WASHINGTON

50916

October 26, 1972

Professor David Anderson, Chairman
Faculty Senate
CWSC

Dear Professor Anderson:

As the CWSC representative on a Task Force on Collective Bargaining of the Council of Faculty Representatives, I wish to inform you and the Senate Executive Committee of our current activity. The Task Force is commissioned to study efforts toward collective bargaining in our respective schools, study proposed enabling legislation to allow for collective bargaining of faculty members, and make recommendations to the CFR. Also implicit in our commission is the suggestion that our recommendations would include information related to the possible coordinating function which the CFR might serve.

We are especially anxious to discover those items our faculties wish to have included in enabling legislation and those items our faculties do not wish to have included. For instance, some bills may specifically define tenure as a negotiable item. We might be able to have the bills submitted written to our specifications if we act promptly.

I would like for you to bring this matter before the Faculty Senate Executive Committee. If the members have suggestions which they feel might be representative of the faculty, or important to the faculty, I would like to include them in my report. In addition, if any of you wish to comment on proposed legislation you have seen, please let me know.

We wish to make a first report to the CFR by November 11. We know of bills and rumors of bills, and we hope to be as comprehensive as possible. I will appreciate any help you can give.

Cordially,

Robert M. Benton

MEMORANDUM

TO: Faculty Senate

FROM: Senate Curriculum Committee

DATE: October 30, 1972

RE: 1. ACCC proposals, pp. 240, 244-46, 248, 250.
2. Graduate Council Proposals, p. 6.
3. Deletions of graduate programs

1. The Senate Curriculum Committee recommends Senate approval of the ACCC approved proposals as follows:

- a. P. 240, in entirety
- b. P. 244-46, with the exception of:
 - 1) P.E. 352.1, 352.2, 352.3 Course Addition, which has been held up pending receipt of a Deletion of PE 352.
 - 2) Sp. & Dr. 253 Course Addition, which has been referred to the Interdepartmental Linguistics Committee.
- c. P. 248, in entirety
- d. P. 250, in entirety

2. The Senate Curriculum Committee recommends Senate approval of Graduate Council-approved proposals as follows:

- a. Graduate Council, p. 6, Bus. Ed. Course Number Change and Music Credit Changes only. Mathematics Course Additions and Program Change are still to be acted on by the SCC.
- b. Deletions of the following M.Ed. programs as approved by the Graduate Council:
 - 1) M.Ed. Biology
 - 2) M.Ed. Jr. High Broad Area
 - 3) M.Ed. Speech Pathology and Audiology
 - 4) M.Ed. Chemistry
 - 5) M.Ed. History

Proposed motion for November Senate meeting

Submitted by Charles McGehee

In view of the Board of Trustees' long delay in approving the Proposed Revision of the Faculty Code, the Senate wishes to reaffirm its full support for the proposed revision and directs the chairman to arrange regular meetings as soon as possible between representatives of the Senate and the President of the College as a means toward securing passage of the Code's revision.

Proposed Motion on Incompletes for November Senate meeting

Submitted by Ken Berry

Definition of an Incomplete. An "I" (incomplete), when recorded, is not a qualitative grade. Rather, it is a symbol which means: "This student, for reasons beyond his control, was not able to complete the course by the end of the term, but had satisfactorily completed a sufficient portion of it and can be expected to finish without having to re-enroll in it."

An "I", not being a grade, is not used in computing a grade-point average.

Establishing a Grade Instead of an Incomplete. To receive a grade in the course, the student must complete the requirements set by the instructor in writing.* The length of time for completing the requirements should be set by the instructor, but shall be not less than the next full quarter in residence. When the instructor turns in the final grade, which can be any grade from "A" to "F", the credits earned and grade points are then added to the student's record. An "I" not removed remains on the student's academic record.

Questions about the above policy should be referred to the appropriate department chairman or program director.

*A copy of the form used to designate the conditions for completing the course will be deposited in the departmental or program office.

11/1/72

REPORT OF SUGGESTED FACULTY RETIREMENT IMPROVEMENTS

RECOMMENDED BY THE COUNCIL
OF FACULTY REPRESENTATIVES*

Retirement Income Goal

1. Retirement income equal, as a minimum, to 50 per cent of the average of the highest two consecutive years of salary:

(a) after 25 years of service at age 65;

(b) benefits to surviving spouse of two-thirds of initial amount;

(c) cost of living adjustments on defined retirement benefits on an annual basis, and

(d) the institutions to pay more than one-half of the input costs.

The CFF recommended, also, a specified schedule of adjustments in retirement benefits for persons having less or fewer years of service; and that the common retirement program be continued on a vested and fully-funded basis.

CFF's CFF Recommendations

1. That in the 1973-75 biennial budget, retirement benefits share first priority with salaries.

2. An increased money input into the TIAA-CREF retirement program. That Federal Social Security input payments be entirely separated from payments going into TIAA-CREF (present practice at the state colleges). The full benefits of each retirement program (TIAA-CREF and Social Security) are needed to meet the rising costs of retirement.

ENDORSED BY THE REGENTS
AND TRUSTEES*

Retirement Income Goal

1. At age 65 and after 25 years of service, a retirement income based upon a joint and two-thirds survivor annuity equivalent, as a minimum, to 50 per cent of the average of the highest two years of salary, including TIAA dividends, but exclusive of Federal Social Security.
2. To the highest degree possible, the retirement goal shall be attained through a fully-funded system based upon matching employer-employee contributions.
3. In the event that the combined TIAA-CREF annuities do not meet the goal, all participants would be eligible for supplementation.

Recommendations--Legislation Required

1. Modification of the present supplementation guarantee (and thus the goal) from 50 per cent of the average salary of the last ten years of full time service to 50 per cent of the average of the highest two years of salary.
2. Authorization to continue supplementation to surviving spouse at an actuarially reduced level.

Recommendations--No Legislation Required

1. Increase the matching contribution rates to TIAA-CREF to a

any participant in the retirement system should be permitted to elect a 10 per cent gross salary contribution to TIAA-CREF upon reaching age fifty. The 10 per cent would be matched by the institutions (present practice at WSU).

Adjustments in retirement benefits to cover annual cost of living changes, so that the purchasing power of the total retirement benefits will not be altered.

That the defined benefit for retirement income be based on the average of the highest two consecutive years of salary (instead of the last ten years).

That supplementation of retirement benefits be made--not on the basis of a single life annuity--but on the basis of joint and two-thirds survivorship, with a ten-year guarantee for all TIAA-CREF certificates. Contributions are made from community property funds; also, both the employee and his spouse must live on the retirement income. In providing for supplementation, some provisions should be made for the continuation of the payments to the spouse upon the death of the retired employee. Supplementation, which is already authorized by existing legislation, should be extended to all faculty and staff covered by TIAA-CREF contracts.

That the universities and colleges pay more than one-half of the input costs to TIAA-CREF, with the ultimate goal of the institutions to pay the entire cost within ten years. This measure should be considered as a part of an increased compensation plan.

Implementation

New legislation will need to be drafted to provide (1) for a change to the two-year rule for supplementation, with

full 7% per cent of salary. The faculty member would contribute 7% per cent of his salary to the TIAA-CREF portion of his retirement program; the institutions would match the 7% per cent.

2. Extend to all participants a matching 10 per cent contribution option at age fifty regardless of entry date into the system (present practice at WSU).
3. Extend the eligibility for supplementation, when required, to all participants in the retirement system (present policy at UW and WSU makes supplementation available only to those participants hired prior to October 1955. The state colleges, though legally permitted, do not provide supplementation benefits).
4. Modify the supplementation calculation formula to include the following:
 - (a) on a joint and two-thirds, including TIAA dividends, basis; (present WSU policy)
 - (b) as if all contributions to TIAA-CREF had been allocated on a 50-50 basis--50 per cent to TIAA, 50 per cent to CREF (the present calculation base assumes that all premiums were paid to TIAA);
 - (c) as if the retiree had participated in the 10 per cent matching contribution at age fifty (present practice at WSU).

For persons age 35 or older

CFR

REGENTS AND TRUSTEES

Benefits adjusted to years
of service; (2) for annual adjustments
to cover changes in the cost of living;
and (3) for a change in the dollar-for-
dollar matching rule.

Underlined portions represent variations in the CFR recommendations
and those endorsed by the Regents and Trustees of the state universi-
ties and colleges.

Prepared by
Ken Harsha, CWSC
October 19, 1972

Charter
of
The College Council
of
Central Washington State College

Preamble

Whereas the ultimate governance of Central Washington State College is by statute vested in the Board of Trustees, and whereas the President as general agent of that Board and chief executive of the College is delegated broad authority in recommending policy from and administering policy within the college community, and whereas all segments of that academic community should be involved in the policy making and administrative processes; we do hereby establish a College Council to facilitate communication and cooperation among faculty, students, staff, and administration, in order that they may jointly promote higher education at Central Washington State College.

Article I Powers and Jurisdiction

Section I

Subject only to the statutory authority of the President and the Board of Trustees and to existing legal or contractual regulations embodied elsewhere, Central Washington State College shall be governed by a College Council, with full and exclusive powers and responsibilities for determining policy and directing its administration. All business of the College shall be conducted through the Council, in accordance with procedures hereinafter set forth. No other legislative or administrative structure or procedure shall be established, nor shall the authority of the College Council be in any other way contravened.

Section II

The specific duties and responsibilities of the Council shall include but not be limited to the following:

1. Serving as the legislative body on all matters relating to curriculum and educational policies of Central Washington State College.
2. Developing and reviewing plans and policies that strengthen educational progress of the College.
3. Reviewing and approving the budgets of the College to assess general conformity with policies and priorities established or endorsed by the Council.
4. Reviewing and approving a master plan for the physical and educational development of the College.

5. Reviewing and approving policies concerning college relations with community, state, and all outside agencies.
6. Reviewing and approving policies and procedures of the college concerning conduct of members.
7. Preserving and promoting academic freedom and academic responsibility within the college community.
8. Promoting the general welfare of the college community.

Article II Membership

Section I

The College Council shall be composed of 51 members, representing all segments of the college community, apportioned as follows:

1. The President of the College, ex officio, non-voting;
2. 21 representatives elected from the Faculty;
3. 12 representatives elected from the Student Body;
4. 2 representatives elected from the supportive Staff;
5. 2 representatives elected from Civil Service employees;
6. 13 ex officio members, as follows:
 - a. Vice-President for Academic Affairs
 - b. Vice-President for Business Affairs
 - c. Dean of Student Development
 - d. Dean of Graduate School
 - e. Dean of Undergraduate Studies
 - f. Dean of Arts and Humanities
 - g. Dean of Social and Behavioral Sciences
 - h. Dean of Natural Science and Mathematics
 - i. Dean of Professional Studies
 - j. President of Associated Students of Central
 - k. Administrative Vice-President of ASC
 - l. Chairman of the Faculty Senate
 - m. Immediate past Chairman of the College Council

Section II Election of Members

- A. Annual elections for representatives to the Council shall be conducted before the end of Winter Quarter, and members shall assume their rights and responsibilities of membership at the first Council session of Spring Quarter.

B. Representatives shall be elected in accordance with the following distributions, procedures, and qualifications:

1) Faculty:

- a. One Faculty representative shall be elected by the Library from among its own members, and five from each of the four Schools. Each department and program within a School may nominate not more than two candidates to a slate, from which the faculty of that School shall, by secret ballot, elect five representatives at-large.
- b. For purposes of representation, Programs not included within the administrative structure of any School will be assigned to the various Schools by the Committee on Committees, in consultation with members of the Programs and in accordance with the principle of equitable distribution.
- c. All full-time faculty shall be eligible to vote for and serve as Council representatives.
- d. Faculty representatives shall serve for terms of three years (except for the initial election, where they shall by lot be divided evenly into one, two, and three year terms in order to insure a perpetual two-thirds carry-over each year), and shall be eligible for re-election to no more than two successive full terms.

2) Students:

- a. One student representative shall be elected from each of the ten districts, and two students at-large.
- b. If a position remains vacant after the time of elections, the Associated Students Legislature shall appoint a representative from that district, no later than one week after elections are concluded.
- c. Any in residence student at Central Washington State College shall be eligible for election or appointment to the Council.
- d. Student representatives shall serve terms of one year, and shall be eligible for re-election to no more than two successive full terms.

3) Support Staff:

- a. The Administrative Group shall nominate four candidates, excluding administrators who are ex officio members of the Council, from which the full-time members of the Support Staff will elect, by secret ballot, two representatives at-large.
- b. Supportive Staff shall be defined as full-time employees of the College who are exempt from Civil Service regulations and whose chief responsibilities are in support of the instructional program.
- c. Staff representatives shall serve terms of two years (except for the initial election, where they shall be assigned by lot to a one and a two year term, in order to assume perpetual carry-over), and be eligible for re-election to no more than two successive full terms.

4) Civil Service:

- a. The Employee Council shall nominate four candidates from which the full-time members of the Civil Service Staff will elect by secret ballot two representatives at-large.
- b. Staff representatives shall serve terms of two years (except for the initial election, where they shall be assigned by lot to a one and a two year term, in order to assume perpetual carry-over), and be eligible for re-election to no more than two successive full terms.

C. Replacements:

- 1) If a Council representative is to be absent for a full quarter, a temporary replacement shall be appointed by the appropriate Policy Committee (Faculty Senate, Associated Students Legislature, Administrative Council, Employees Council). The temporary replacement must be from the same School, district, or group as the elected Council representative. Names of all replacements must be filed with the Council Secretary prior to the first meeting at which they shall serve.
- 2) If a Council representative is to be absent for more than one quarter, that representative shall resign and a replacement shall be elected by the Faculty, Staff, or Civil Service or appointed by the Associated Students Legislature, whichever is appropriate, to complete the remainder of the term. The replacement shall be eligible for re-election to two successive full terms.

Article III Officers of the Council

Section I

Principal officers of the College Council shall be elected annually by the Council from among its own members at the first meeting of each Spring Quarter. Only elected representatives are eligible to serve as officers. Principal officers shall be a Chairman, Vice-Chairman, and Secretary. They shall serve in office for terms of one year, and be eligible for re-election to no more than two successive full terms.

Section II Duties

- A. Chairman: The Chairman shall be the presiding officer at all meetings of the College Council and of the Executive Committee. The Chairman or any Council member designated by the chair shall serve as official representative and spokesman of the Council in communication with the faculty, the Board of Trustees of the College, the administration, the student body, the supportive staff, Civil Service employees, and others on all matters concerning the Council or its actions. The Chairman, as chief executive officer of the Council, shall be responsible for coordinating and expediting the business of the College Council and its committees.
- B. Vice-Chairman: The Vice-Chairman shall report and explain to the College Council the actions and recommendations of the Executive Committee. The Vice-Chairman shall serve in the place of the Chairman in the latter's absence. In the event of a vacancy in the chairmanship after the beginning of the Chairman's term of office, the Vice-Chairman shall become the Chairman and serve as such for the remainder of the Chairman's term of office, and a new Vice-Chairman shall be elected.
- C. Secretary: The Secretary shall keep the minutes and records of the College Council and the Executive Committee, and supervise the work of the recording secretary. It is the Secretary's responsibility to schedule and advertise to the college community all public hearings of the Policy Committees. All petitions for review or reconsideration of Council action, or for action to be considered by the Council, shall be filed with the Secretary. The Secretary shall make arrangements for all membership elections to the College Council, and shall perform such other duties as are prescribed by the Executive Committee.

Article IV Committees

Section I

There shall be established by or within the College Council

the following committees:

1. Executive Committee
2. Committee on Committees
3. Standing Policy Committees
4. Standing Operational Committees
5. Ad hoc committees, appointed at the discretion of the College Council

Section II Executive Committee

A. Composition:

The Executive Committee shall have 11 members, as follows: Chairman, Vice-Chairman, Secretary, and Immediate Past Chairman of the College Council, Vice-President for Academic Affairs, Vice-President for Business Affairs, Chairman of the Committee on Committees, President of ASC, Administrative Vice-President of ASC, Chairman of the Faculty Senate, and President of the College (non-voting).

B. Executive Committee members shall not be eligible to serve in a voting capacity on the Committee on Committees nor on appointive Standing Policy Committees.

C. Powers and Duties:

1. To perform the leadership role for the College Council;
2. To receive, evaluate, and direct the disposition of all items directed to the Council for consideration;
3. To compile and publish the agenda for each regular meeting of the Council, at least one week in advance;
4. To meet at least once weekly to review and consider Council business;
5. To originate matters for Council consideration;
6. To discuss matters of Council business with the various committees, administrators, and other College groups or individuals;
7. To act on behalf of the Council when necessary; such actions to be subject to later ratification by the Council at its next regular meeting;
8. To exercise other powers or duties delegated or assigned to it by the College Council.

Section III Committee on Committees

A. The Committee on Committees shall be comprised of 8 members, elected at-large by the Council from its own membership at the second meeting of each Spring Quarter, according to the following apportionment:

1. 4 Faculty members, 1 from each School
2. 2 student members from elected student representatives
3. 1 member from College supportive Staff
4. 1 Chairman

B. Duties:

1. The Committee on Committees shall appoint members to all College committees, except as otherwise specified herein. It shall give due recognition to special provinces of interest in each case but with a limitation of no more than two-thirds of the membership of each committee representing any one segment of the college community.
2. The Committee on Committees shall also assign Programs or faculty groups not included within the administrative structure to the various Schools for purposes of representation, in consultation with members of each program and with the principle of equitable distribution.
3. The Committee on Committees shall also maintain a continuing study of the College committee structure, and make recommendations for alterations thereof to the College Council.

Section IV Standing Policy Committees

A. The College Council shall create standing Policy Committees, including but not limited to the following:

1. The Faculty Senate, serving as the Policy Committee on Faculty Affairs
2. The Associated Student Legislature, serving as the Policy Committee on Student Affairs
3. The Administrative Council, serving as the Policy Committee on Staff Affairs
4. The Employees Council, serving as the Policy Committee on Civil Service Employees Affairs
5. Curriculum and Instruction
6. Budget and Business Management
7. Campus Management and Development

B. With the exceptions of the elective Faculty Senate, Associated Students Legislature, Administrative Council, and Employees Council, members of Policy Committees shall be appointed annually by the Committee on Committees from the college community at-large. There shall be no limitation upon re-appointments. At least one fourth of the membership of each committee shall be re-appointed annually, with the exception of the four elective Committees, which have self-determination of their rules of membership. Each committee shall elect its own chairman.

C. Policy Committees act either upon charge from the College Council or upon their own initiative. They may refer matters to their Operational Committees for study. Before arriving at any recommendation, they must hold at least one public hearing, which shall be scheduled and advertised in the college community by

the Secretary of the College Council at least one week in advance. They shall report findings and recommendations to the College Council, and must report progress to the Council periodically in case of extended study and deliberation.

Section V Standing Operational Committees

- A. Standing Operational Committees shall be established for each Policy Committee, upon joint recommendation of that Policy Committee and the Committee on Committees.
- B. Members of Operational Committees shall be appointed by the Committee on Committees, in consultation with the appropriate Policy Committee. Operational Committees may initiate action, but they shall generally receive charges from and shall always make reports and recommendations to the Policy Committee to which they are responsible. Each committee shall elect its own chairman.

Article V Conduct of Business

Section I

The College Council shall meet regularly on the first and third Wednesdays of each month. Upon request or need, special sessions may be called by the Executive Committee. An agenda for each meeting will be prepared and distributed by the Executive Committee three days in advance. Minutes will be maintained on file, and distributed to all members of the Council, Faculty Senate, Associated Students Legislature, Administrative Council, Employees Council and Board of Trustees. Both agenda and minutes will be printed in the various college publications. Meetings will be conducted according to Roberts' Rules of Order, with the exceptions of the following special provisions:

Section II

Committee recommendations and Council motions cannot be acted upon during the meeting at which they are introduced, but must instead be presented as formal written motions for action at the next regular meeting.

Section III

All action by the Council shall require the concurrence of the majority of the full membership. The Council may convene for purposes of discussion without a quorum, but cannot pass motions without a simple majority of the full membership in attendance and in agreement.

Section IV

Policy decisions of the College Council shall be immediately submitted in writing to the President for his approval and signature. Should he reject the recommendation, he will so inform the Council, in writing and with his reasons, before the next regular meeting. Upon a two-thirds vote of its full membership, the Council will then have the right of appeal, through its Executive Committee, to the Trustees at the next regular Board meeting. The decision of the Board of Trustees will be final and binding.

Article VI Review

All actions of the College Council are subject to review upon written petition of the Faculty Senate, Associated Students Legislature, Administrative Council, or Employees Council. The petition for review must be filed with the Secretary of the College Council no later than 12 days after the Council action. The petition for review will return the matter to the appropriate Standing Policy Committee for further public hearing, deliberation, and recommendation to the Council. Once the Council has voted again, no further appeal is possible within the same academic year.

Article VII Initiative

Any 5 percent of the Student Body, the Faculty, the supportive staff, or the Civil Service employees may, by written petition filed with the Secretary of the College Council, secure consideration, with reasonable promptness, of any policy matter, other than those already subjected to review under Article VI within the same academic year. The filing of such a petition requires that the matter be referred to committee immediately or placed on the Council agenda within the next month.

Article VIII Amendments

Proposals for amendments to this Charter must be submitted in writing to the Executive Committee by the Faculty Senate, Associated Students Legislature, Administrative Council, Employees Council, or Board of Trustees. The Executive Committee shall then conduct public hearings, scheduled and advertised at least one week in advance, throughout the college community. Any subsequent revision of the proposed amendment can be made only with the approval of the sponsoring body. The amendment, as revised, shall then be advertised in the college community at least one week in advance of the written vote. Adoption of the amendment shall require approval by each of the constituent bodies (Faculty, Students, Support Staff, and Civil Service Employees), a simple majority of those voting constituting approval by each of these bodies, and by the Board of Trustees.

Article IX Ratification

Ratification of this Charter shall require formal approval by the Faculty, Students, Civil Service Employees and Board of Trustees, as follows:

- A. Adoption by the Faculty and Board of Trustees of a Code amendment, in accordance with the procedures specified in the Faculty Code, incorporating the College Council Charter within that Code.
- B. Adoption by the Students of a Constitutional amendment, in accordance with procedures specified in the Associated Students of Central Constitution incorporating the College Council Charter within that constitution.
- C. Adoption by the Civil Service Employees to be determined by a simple majority of those voting.